



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,613	12/17/2001	Patrick Baudisch	D/A1188	5897
7590	03/13/2006		EXAMINER	
Patent Documentation Center			RICHER, AARON M	
Xerox Corporation			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Xerox Square 20th Floor				
100 Clinton Ave., S.			2676	
Rochester, NY 14644			DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/015,613	BAUDISCH, PATRICK
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Aaron M. Richer	2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 9 recites "at last one". It appears that this was intended to read "at least one". Further, lines 7-8 read "the display areas being so constructed and arranged such that an image displayed across at least two display areas". This is grammatically incorrect when read with the rest of the claim. It is suggested that applicant insert the word "is" between "image" and "displayed". Appropriate correction is required.

3. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 7-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 7 recites the limitations "the first pixel size" and "the second pixel size" in line 3. Because the recitations of "a first pixel size" and "a second pixel size" have been amended out of claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the above-mentioned limitations in claim 7.

7. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the third display area" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 16 mentions two display areas, but not a third.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, 22-23, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seidensticker (U.S. Patent 5,920,327).

10. As to claims 1, 4, 11, and 22, Seidensticker discloses a display comprising at least two display areas,

each display area having a given display resolution and a boundary wherein the display resolution of at least one display area is different from the

display resolution of at least one other display area and the boundary of each display area is at least partially contiguous with the boundary of at least one other display area (fig. 2, fig. 4-9; col. 3, lines 32-40; col. 4, lines 37-col. 5, line 33),

the display areas being so constructed and arranged such that an image is displayed across at least two display areas (fig. 2, fig. 4-9),

wherein the display resolution of at least one of the at least two display areas is different from the display resolution of at least one other of the at least two display areas (fig. 2, fig. 4-9; col. 3, lines 32-40; col. 4, lines 37-col. 5, line 33),

the resulting displayed image is perceived as substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image (col. 3, lines 41-49),

and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on one of the at least two display areas is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on at least one other of the two display areas (fig. 2, fig. 4-9; col. 3, lines 32-40; col. 4, lines 37-col. 5, line 33).

11. As to claims 2, 12, and 23, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein one display area comprises an LCD display (col. 2, lines 42-47).

12. As to claims 5 and 25, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein one display area is adjacent to another display area (fig. 7-9; col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 33).

13. As to claims 6, 14, 26, and 27, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein the first display area is surrounded by the second display area (fig. 6; col. 4, lines 37-65).

14. As to claim 7, as best interpreted, Seidensticker discloses a third display area having pixels of a third pixel size, wherein the third pixel size is different from at least one of the first pixel size and the second pixel size, and a third boundary (fig. 9; col. 5, lines 26-39; because of the lack of antecedent basis, "pixel size" is being interpreted the same way "resolution" would be).

15. As to claims 8, 15, and 19, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein the first display area surrounds the second and third display areas (fig. 6, fig. 9; col. 4, lines 37-65; col. 5, lines 26-39).

16. As to claim 10, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein the second display area surrounds the third display area (fig. 9; col. 5, lines 26-39).

17. As to claims 16 and 17, Seidensticker discloses 2 display areas in one embodiment (fig. 6) and 3 display areas in another (fig. 9).

18. As to claim 18, Seidensticker discloses a display wherein there are 5 display areas. Seidensticker discloses a display in which a "1:1 portion gradually fades into 2:1 resolution, 3:1, 4:1, etc." in col. 1, lines 50-51. Given the explicit statement of 4 areas, followed by an "et cetera", a 5<sup>th</sup> display area is implicit in the disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 3, 13, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker.
21. As to claims 3, 13, and 24, Seidensticker does not expressly disclose a display wherein one display area comprises a projection surface. Seidensticker does disclose that many other non-LCD technologies for display can be used. Official notice has been taken of the fact that projection surfaces used for display are well-known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Seidensticker to display on a projection surface in order to enable compatibility with a larger number of display devices.
22. Claims 9, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker in view of Duchowski.
23. As to claims 9, 20, and 21, Seidensticker does not expressly disclose a display wherein in the second and third display areas are spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed there between. Seidensticker does disclose multiple areas, but only in a concentric or side-by-side pattern. Duchowski, however, discloses a multi-resolution map with *multiple* regions of interest, surrounded by regions with less detail (p. 1439-1440, heading III-IV). It is noted that two non-contiguous regions of interest surrounded by an area of less detail would read on these claims. The motivation to combine these references is to maximize display rates by only displaying detail in multiple

Art Unit: 2676

regions that matter to a viewer (p. 1437, heading I). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Seidensticker to used spaced-apart regions of interest in order to maximize display rates as taught by Duchowski.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron M. Richer whose telephone number is (571) 272-7790. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMR  
3/2/06



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600